UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Roman Catholic Church Vs. Communism - - - - - *Clifford Vessey*

Can America Lead a World in Revolution? - - - - - - - *Lester Mondale*

Is Human Life Worth Saving? - - - - - - - - - - *Edward Podolsky*

Religion and History — An Interpretation - - - - *F. H. Amphlett Micklewright*

How Free Is Our Press? - - - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Is Science Good for Man? - *R. C. Mullenix*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXV NUMBER 2

Chicago, May-June, 1949

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Society of Brooklyn, New York.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright: Minister of Cross St. Chapel, Manchester, England.

Lester Mondale: Minister of All Souls Unitarian Church of Kansas City, Missouri.

R. C. Mullenix: Formerly, Professor of Chemistry and Biology in Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois.

Edward Podolsky: Psychiatrist in the Mental Hygiene Clinic, Kings County Hospital, Brooklyn, New York.

Clifford Vessey: Minister of White Plains Community Church, White Plains, New York.

James M. Yard: Director Emeritus of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 23

ARTICLES—

The Roman Catholic Church Vs. Communism—CLIFFORD VESSEY 24
Can America Lead a World in Revolution?—LESTER MONDALE 26
Is Human Life Worth Saving?—EDWARD PODOLSKY 29
Religion and History — An Interpretation — F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT 30
How Free Is Our Press?—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 33
Is Science Good for Man?—R. C. MULLENIX 35

THE STUDY TABLE—

Rugged Pietist—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 36
Primitive Culture—GARDNER WILLIAMS 36
Dynamic of Service—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 37
The Majority Problem—JAMES M. YARD 37
Accurate Psychiatric Discussion—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 38

CORRESPONDENCE—

In Reply to Mr. Yarros—ROBERT W. LUCE 38

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 39

THE FIELD—

Civil Liberties—*Public Affairs Committee* 22

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Civil Liberties

Americans are warned lest in seeking to punish treasonable activities they jeopardize their heritage of civil liberties. For protection against the present-day threats to our liberty, we need a "thorough knowledge and appreciation of our basic civil rights" declares Dr. Robert E. Cushman in *New Threats to American Freedoms,* Pamphlet No. 143, published by the Public Affairs Committee, 22 East 38th Street, New York.

Dr. Cushman, Goodwin Smith Professor of Government at Cornell University and a leading authority in the field of civil liberties, describes the present, postwar threats to our fundamental rights as "more serious" than any faced by the American people "at almost any time during their entire history," and warns against confusing intolerance with patriotism.

He finds us in "danger of losing sight of the vitally important stake that the community as a whole, and every individual member of it, has in the preservation of our freedoms," and cites a number of reasons for this situation.

"We are," Dr. Cushman declares, "badly scared. . . . We are fearful lest the cold war with Soviet Russia lead us into another 'fighting' war. . . . Many of us fear that an undisclosed number of people in our midst are seeking to undermine our institutions by placing men and women whose first loyalty is to Soviet Russia in key positions in our political and economic life. Troubled by what seems to be a threat to our national security, we are groping for ways to deal with that menace."

The necessity for absolute secrecy surrounding our work with atomic energy and other new military weapons is also cited as a factor which seems to justify exceptional precautions.

"This secrecy," Dr. Cushman adds, "provides an opaque screen behind which a vast range of governmental operations are carried on, and makes it impossible for the public to judge how necessary the re-

(Continued on page 37)

UNITY

Volume CXXXV MAY-JUNE, 1949 No. 2

EDITORIAL

In the Autumn Dr. John Haynes Holmes will retire from the active pastorate of The Community Church of New York City. He will be succeeded by the Reverend Donald Harrington. Rarely has a minister had such a long and distinguished career in one church as has Dr. Holmes; and rarely has a minister been succeeded in his pastorate by one so markedly suited to the succession as is the Reverend Mr. Harrington. For some years these two men have been a team with a common purpose and program. In outlook and temperament they have been as one. Dr. Holmes' continued association with the church will be a blessing to the church and a source of strength to Mr. Harrington. It is not yet time to appraise the career of John Haynes Holmes, for he will continue to be active in good causes. It can be pointed out, however, that his has been one of the most remarkable careers in the history of the American pulpit. In platform eloquence he has had few equals. As a preacher and lecturer he has possessed the power to stir audiences to the depths of their being. He has written hymns that will never die. He has become widely recognized as a literary critic. He has championed the great social reform movements of his day. He has been utterly fearless in defense of civil liberties. His vision of the Community Church Movement has been far in advance of that of the denominational churches that have added the name Community to their title. The young radicals in the liberal churches have looked to him for inspiration and guidance. His printed sermons and numerous books have widened the outlook of many ministers and influenced their preaching. He has given to minority groups a voice that has been heard throughout the land. His life and work have been of such character and excellence that even his opponents have admired him. His legion of friends wish for him and his successor every possible satisfaction in their new relationship.

CURTIS W. REESE.

The Roman Catholic Church Vs. Communism

CLIFFORD VESSEY

Americans who are non-Catholic, anti-Communist and pro-democracy are caught in a dangerous squeeze between two totalitarian political powers, as the Roman Catholic Church and the Communist world move into a state of open warfare with each other. Pope Pius has declared, through a world-wide propaganda apparatus which commands instant attention of press and radio everywhere, that this is "the conflict between the good and the wicked," and tremendous pressure is being brought to bear—which we all feel at some point—to rally behind the Vatican in the belief that by so doing we are "fighting shoulder to shoulder with all defenders of religious freedom and democracy."

We are confronted with a problem which perplexes and disturbs many of us and which certainly needs clarifying. It is an issue concerning which we cannot remain indifferent or acquiescent. Every American, I hope and trust, has the good sense not to allow his concern or indignation, however deeply felt, about the present political activities of the Roman Catholic Church, to spill over into blind hatred or prejudice against fellow citizens whose religious faith happens to be that of Roman Catholicism. But we must also be intelligent and realistic enough to realize that if we let this "squeeze play" continue without protest; if we ignore positive acts and authoritative declarations of the Church which many of us believe are plainly contrary to our American tradition of religious liberty and separation of Church and State; if we wake up some morning to find that the United States has been committed by political maneuvering, during a panic of propaganda, to side with the Vatican in a holy war in which the Church is already engaged, there will be a resurgence of religious intolerance, bitterness, and prejudice which all of us dread and deplore. It is this we would avoid, by facing certain facts honestly and boldly before it is too late.

Let it be made clear that the question is not whether we should or should not combat Communism, or whether or not Communism is "wicked." On this the overwhelming majority of Americans are in complete agreement. We must combat Communism as contrary to our whole tradition of freedom and democracy. But what we fight against and what we fight for depends upon with whom we fight. The cornerstone of the Christian ethic in combating evil is that you cannot "overcome evil with evil." There are three facts which all of us, particularly in America, should keep clearly in mind regarding the Church which claims to represent the good in this "conflict between the good and the wicked."

First of all we should remember that Pope Pius XII, in his allocution last Christmas Eve, committed the Roman Catholic Church to a state of open and relentless warfare, including use of arms if necessary, against Communist states and "all other enemies of the Lord and His Church." He gave final answer to those moderates within the Church who have contended that no modern war could meet the Church's requirement of a "just war." He pointed out that the sole consideration of the sorrows and evils resulting from war do not necessarily determine whether it is licit, or even in certain circumstances obligatory, to resort to force of arms.

Cardinal Mindszenty's arrest the day after Christmas was the Communists' reply. His subsequent trial was unquestionably a farce, as judged by our American standards and ideals of a fair trial. But it is significant that the Cardinal's confession of treason against the existing government in Hungary is not denied by the Church. There is no talk of mysterious drugs being used in his courageous and uncompromising defense against the charge of treason. He defended himself on the ground that he was openly and actively opposed to the existing government in Hungary and that he considered himself, as Primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary, at war with that regime, and that he did what he had done to fight that war. In our effort to understand and make up our own minds about the Mindszenty case and all subsequent "affairs" in a struggle which will continue with increasing intensity, it is important for us to keep in mind that the Vatican has declared war on all Communist-dominated governments and "other enemies of God and His Church," that both contestants are prepared to use every propaganda and political weapon at their disposal, and that each has cleared the way for use of arms if necessary and feasible.

A second fact, however, must also be very much in our minds. This is a clash between two political powers, both of which are totalitarian in their political philosophy and practice. We should not make the mistake of assuming that the opponent of one form of totalitarianism is necessarily the champion of democracy. This goes either way, but the real danger in America is that we will be led into the belief that in supporting the Church against the Communists we are, *ipso facto,* defending democracy and religious freedom. This is the Vatican strategy in America, and at the moment it is amazingly successful.

Since the time of the formulation of its political philosophy under Pope Gregory the Great in the sixth century, the Catholic Church has considered itself, through its divine prerogatives, above all earthly institutions, the one true Church, founded and appointed by God to rule over His Kingdom on earth. Sovereignty rests, ultimately, not with the people but with God and his appointed rulers, the Popes and Princes of His Church. The Church has never compromised, except under duress or where it was deemed temporarily expedient, with this basic goal. No well-informed Roman Catholic spokesman would even want to deny this. He would defend religious totalitarianism, the total rule of God, right down the line. He would argue that the Church would betray her trust if she renounced this thesis, except where temporary circumstances made it expedient.

It may very well be that religious totalitarianism, or ecclesiastical absolutism, is more palatable than Communist forms, but neither is or can be truly democratic in principle and practice. Neither will wholeheartedly place complete sovereignty in the hands of the people, making government not only for the people, but really of and by the people. We know what happens to democracy under Communist-dominated governments. But we should not forget in our effort to

combat Communism that the Roman Catholic Church, with its own totalitarian philosophy, has again and again throughout its history preferred and supported authoritarian forms of government and their political parties and rulers as against out-and-out democracies. Long before the advent of Communism, struggling democracies and democratic or republican movements had to fight the Church. This is true today in Spain, in Portugal, in Italy, and in Latin American countries where the Church is dominant, such as Colombia and Argentina. Had the Catholic Church supported real democracy and democratic movements in Russia where the Church was almost identical with the State and reigned supreme for centuries, the Communist revolution might never have taken place. In the 1920s when Italy was vacillating between social democracy and Fascism, the Roman Catholic Church supported Mussolini. It is extremely doubtful that Mussolini could have gained control without this powerful backing. These are some of the considerations which should be uppermost in the minds of all lovers of freedom and defenders of democracy in America who are asked to unite with the Roman Catholic Church in an all-out struggle "between the good and the wicked."

The third fact which is of particular importance for Protestants and for religious minorities in America is the Roman Catholic doctrine and practice regarding freedom of religion. This is of the utmost significance at this time because of its far-reaching implications and because a great many Americans are not aware of the monumental difference between freedom of religion and "freedom of the Church." Roman Catholicism always qualifies religious freedom as freedom of "true religion," and "rights of the Church," the "one true Church" being the Roman Catholic Church. So much dust has been thrown in our eyes that it is high time we understood clearly just what the Roman Catholic concept of religious freedom really is. People are accused of being intolerant and prejudiced who do nothing more than state this position with some degree of clarity so that non-Catholics can judge for themselves. If you want this information you can get it straight from the Catholic press or in the literature rack of most any Catholic Church. The Paulist Press and the Catholic Information Society, both having offices in New York City and elsewhere, will gladly send pamphlets containing Church teachings and doctrines on this subject. The important thing is to read for yourselves, direct from official sources, the Roman Catholic position regarding freedom of religion, freedom of worship, and rights of the Church, rather than rely on vague generalizations and phrases which so often appear in the public press.

One of the clearest statements of the Catholic position on religious freedom appeared last year in Rome in *La Civilita Cattolica.* The following is a complete quotation of an excerpt of this statement as it appeared in *Time,* June 28, 1948:

> The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a *de facto* existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs. If, however, actual circumstances... make the complete application of this principle impossible, then the church will require for herself all possible concessions....
>
> In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabitate where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the church does not renounce her thesis... but merely adapts herself.... Hence arises the great scandal among Protestants.... We ask Protestants to understand that the Catholic church would betray her trust if she were to proclaim,... that error can have the same rights as truth.... The church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.

In *Catholic Principles of Politics* by Ryan and Boland, bearing the imprimatur of Francis Spellman, now Cardinal, this same position is clearly stated with a concluding word of assurance that while this is true "in logic and theory" American Protestants need not be alarmed since the fulfillment of this principle "toward non-Catholics in the United States is so improbable and so far in the future that it should not occupy their time or attention."

These words have failed to reassure many people who see what is happening when this concept of religious freedom is carried from "logic and theory" into practice where the Catholic Church enjoys a majority status. Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell, minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City, publicly expressed such concern regarding Spain and promptly received clippings and calls from Catholic authorities categorically denying that there is any persecution or repression of religious minorities in Spain. Referring to this, Dr. Bonnell states in the January, 1949, issue of the *Christian Century Pulpit:*

> Last summer I determined to go to Spain and investigate the situation at first hand. I discovered that all Protestant schools in Spain are closed and the children required to go to schools where Roman Catholic instruction is compulsory. Protestants are not permitted publicly to bury their dead with the rites of their churches; to print hymn books or Bibles; to reply in the public press to any attacks made on them; or to place any signs on their churches denoting they are places of worship. They have been jailed and fined for holding meetings of Bible study and prayer in their homes. There have been repeated disorders, culminating in the case at Linares on June 27, 1948, with attacks on Protestant worshippers by thirty Catholic youths using rubber truncheons and brass knuckles.

Homer Bigart, roving correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune,* has recently reported on an extensive investigation of conditions in Spain. I quote from the leading paragraphs of his report on "religious freedom" in Spain, in the February 23, 1949, issue of the *Herald Tribune:*

> Under the Falangist government the Spanish Protestant is a second-class citizen. He cannot hold official position in the government, nor can he rise to officer's rank in the army unless he conceals his religious beliefs. He is not allowed to practice his faith in public. The chapel he attends must not display any exterior evidence that it is a place of worship. It cannot advertise its existence—not even with a bulletin board. It cannot be listed in the public directories. The Protestant clergyman in Spain suffers much the same type of persecution as the Roman Catholic clergy endure in Communist Hungary.... The Catholic Action paper *Ecclesia* said the issue was clear: It would be an error for any one to believe that the charter of Spanish rights is legal justification for the opening of chapels, the publication of reviews and pamphlets, the distribution of Bibles which are not Catholic, or propaganda of any kind.

From this it becomes clear that there is an all-important distinction between freedom of religion and freedom of "true" religion, or freedom of "the Church." There is religious freedom in Spain, they say, but it is freedom for the "one true religion" and none other. Religious freedom has played a very great role in the history and development of America from its earliest

beginnings down to the living present. Freedom of religion, however, means different things in different religious traditions. We should always keep clearly in mind what religious freedom means to the Roman Catholic Church. It has never been more succinctly expressed than in the pamphlet, *Freedom of Worship—The Catholic Position,* by Francis J. Connell, published by the Paulist Press, and also carrying the Imprimatur of Francis Cardinal Spellman.

> They [the Roman Catholics] believe that the Catholic Church is the only organization authorized by God to teach religious truth and to conduct public religious worship. Consequently, they hold that any creed which differs from that of the Catholic Church is erroneous, and that any religious organization which is separated from the Catholic Church lacks the approval and authorization of God.
>
> ...From this it follows that, as far as God's law is concerned, no one has a real right to accept any religion save the Catholic religion, or to be a member of any church save the Catholic Church, or to practice any form of divine worship save that commanded or sanctioned by the Catholic Church.... Such then is the first Catholic principle relevant to religious liberty—that man has not an unqualified right to practice any religion he may choose.... Neither does it necessarily oblige others to allow him the unrestricted practice of his religious beliefs.

In summary, the Roman Catholic Church is making an all-out effort to win and commit the United States to moral, political, and, if necessary, military support of the Vatican in its warfare against Communist states "and other conspirators against the Lord and His Church." Others in America who are also in a "let's fight it out now with Russia" mood are making the most of the support given by the Pope's blessing and aggressive tactics. It is a fearful combination and the possible consequence of this dual drive—a holy atomic war—is something you and I dare not disregard. Every American should think long and hard before joining forces with either of these contestants. Both are totalitarian powers, in philosophy and program, aspiring to world domination—one in the name of God and His Church, (the Roman Catholic, being the "only true Church"), and the other in the name of the proletariat, but neither in the name of democracy and religious freedom as many of us understand it in terms of American tradition and ideals.

Our best armor in the struggle with totalitarianism, with Fascism and Communism, is democracy and freedom all down the line, economic, political and religious. I am confident that what we know and aspire to as the democratic, free way of life has every advantage in this struggle. The world's people are still passionately biased in favor of true democracy and freedom and will choose it any time they are given a real choice. They look to America, not the Vatican, for leadership and support. Let us provide this leadership and support while there is yet time, by making wise and vigorous use of this best armor of our way of life—real democracy and freedom, economic, political *and* religious.

Can America Lead a World in Revolution?

LESTER MONDALE

America, as most Americans see it in the world today, reminds one of the rabbit in the story that was told me some years ago by a woods farmer who lived in a log cabin on the banks of the Flambeau River in the forests of northern Wisconsin. Not long before I met him he had come across a snowshoe rabbit in a thicket, behaving as if it had lost its mind. In amazement he saw it take a short quick hop as if to run, then come to an abrupt stop; wheel and hop in the oppposite direction, only to slam on his brakes again. Moving closer noiselessly he soon discovered the cause of the rabbit's peculiar behavior. A few more wheelings, stops, and starts, and the rabbit stood still, all but paralyzed, shivering with terror—for no matter where he turned he ran square-on into a weasel. It was the same weasel each time, of course, but so incredibly swift was he, darting in semicircles through the grass and brush, that no matter what direction his next meal turned there he was also, blocking escape.

That is where the beady-eyed terror they all call Communism has the bulk of Americans today. Popping up in the form of revolt in Korea, threatening the American-backed, tottering and none-too-progressive regime of Syngman Rhee. . . . Communism! Sweeping over the whole of rich Manchuria, and down into and across north China, veteran guerilla bands now organized into armies of hundreds of thousands. . . . Communism again! In the Philippines, thousands of embattled farmers, Hukbalahaps, refusing because of some unexplained perversity to lay down arms furnished them for fighting the Japanese—a political force that might well overthrow the present government were American support to be withdrawn—Communism! From the *Eastern Economist of New Delhi,* the issue published July 30, 1948: "The gates of India are Burma and Malaya. If the events of the last three months in those countries have any meaning at all, that meaning is that we are . . . in mortal danger." Communism! A Pan-American conferencce in Bogota, Colombia, a liberal leader assassinated, a city in the grip of rioting mobs, millions of dollars of Catholic churches and Catholic publishing houses burned and destroyed. . . . Communism! Unrest and violent hatred for the United States over the whole of Central and South America. . . . Communism! Nation-wide strikes in France designed, we are told, to counteract whatever good might have been derived from the Marshall Plan. . . . Communism! Italy, Spain with revolution always just around the corner; Greece in the lowest depths of a bestial civil war . . . Communism! And then Russia in Asia, Russia in Europe; plus the war "take" in eastern Asia, plus the war "take" in the West, amounting in all to more than the half of old Europe—and this advance, in fewer years than you can count on the fingers of one hand. . . . Communism!

Such is the perilous rabbit-versus-weasel world situation today; the world situation, I must hasten to add, *on the twelve-year-old level of apprehension.* If this is our level of apprehension, and if we also share the panic of everyone who screams Communism whichever way he turns, then our idea of the way out will be the superficially obvious one of atomically searing

Russia, which means searing tens of millions of men, women, and children in the desperate hope of destroying the weasel himself.

How effective an international St. Bartholomew's massacre would be, and how reliable is the judgment of the one who screams Communism wherever he sees revolt or unrest, becomes obvious the moment we evaluate today's trends in terms of the principles of the sociology of revolutions. The sober and factual truth is this, that what the hysterical call Communism is in reality only a stupidly ignorant misnomer for at least six different kinds or species of social revolution . . . all except one of which should be more of a consolation than a terror to us here in America!

Communist revolution, the real thing (to begin with the one revolution that is not exactly a consolation to us)—the revolt in a modern industrial state where free enterprise has broken down and where a class-conscious industrial proletariat is organized into unions under Communist leadership—is a real and imminent threat in only two countries of the world today: France and Italy. Both countries—France, what with its preparation for revolution under the Nazi occupation; Italy with its preparation under Mussolini—are sociologically ripe for all that is implied in the phrase: Communist dictatorship of the proletariat. Here is an eventuality that chills the spines of most Americans.

Suppose these two nations did go Communist and thus permitted themselves to be swallowed by Russia; swallowed, in other words, not by a genuine Socialist or Communist state, but by the monstrous bureaucratic tyranny that has evolved out of a desperate attempt to terrorize a peasant people into creating and handling a socialized industrial system. How the working classes of these two nations—however ripe their states may be for an overturn of the ruling classes and for a genuine socialization of their economies—could ever hope to better themselves by gearing their own efficient production to the hopelessly inefficient Russian system, by reducing their consumption to that of the general level of Russian poverty, by working and living under the constant surveillance of secret police and firing squads, is by no means easy to understand. Certainly the task of showing the proletariat of France and Italy the hopelessness of absorption by Russia and showing them some happier way out should not be too impossibly difficult. Everything, of course, hinges on whether or not we Americans can bring ourselves to a less hysterical and at the same time to a more realistic world outlook; whether or not, in other words, we can see ourselves in the role to which we have been shaped by our natural inheritance —that of leader, rather than repressor, of a world in revolution.

Most of the revolutions now in progress in different places over the globe are, as I have suggested, Communist in name only. But more than this: *In reality they are nothing more nor less than the different revolutions that have become part and parcel of our national heritage,* the spiritual source of the awesome power and the drive and the ingenuity and the independence that have come to be associated with the word, American.

First among these revolutions is that which we associate with the spectacle of a lone man standing in 1521 before the assembled nobility and higher clergy of the German Reichstag that had been summoned by Emperor Charles V, august ruler of the far-flung Holy Roman Empire. This man had been condemned and excommunicated by the Pope. Like John Huss before him he had been promised safe conduct by an Emperor —but Huss, nevertheless, had been burned at the stake. On a table before the heretic were the books he had written. Would he or would he not recant what he had said in them? What he had written, in substance, was this, that the relationship of the common man to God was not so mysterious, not so complicated, not so beyond his intellectual capacities that to save his soul from hell, from fear, he had to depend on the expert services of a supposedly learned hierarchy of priestly specialists. What he had written was the common man's declaration of independence against an all-powerful Church that had presumed to exercise over the mind and over the spirit of man what was nothing less than a Fascist dictatorship. Would he recant? From the bull-necked Wittenberg Doctor of Philosophy, vicar over eleven monastaries: "I cannot do otherwise. Here I stand. God help me, Amen."

America—thanks to our inheritance of the religious revolution that stemmed from this courageous declaration of independence against a Fascist dictatorship over the mind and spirit of man—is an America of separation of Church and State, of religious freedom, of free universities and free inquiry, as well as an America of the kind of citizen who is not in any mood to let specialists, political or priestly, bamboozle him into the humility and the docility that would cause him to relinquish the independent marking of his ballot in whatsoever manner he might deem fitting or proper.

Today this revolution which began as a Protestant revolution is by no means confined to Protestantism, as we have seen in recent years in Mexico and elsewhere in South America, where progressive Catholics themselves have been driven to declare a Protestant-like independence from a medieval church dictatorship. When progressive Catholics in Mexico set this revolution going the cry was raised north of the border: Communism! Communist-led it may possibly have been—but the revolution itself, and in itself, was nothing more than the same thing that has literally filtered and fibred the soul of the United States of America. In Colombia, South America, last year, when the city of Bogota was aflame with the fires of Catholic churches and Catholic publishing houses, the word went out over the wires: Communism! On reconsideration it was found that there was little or no evidence to support the claim that these riots were Communist-led. Nothing more nor less there than the familiar rebellion of the human spirit against a dictatorship over the mind and the soul of a nation. Spain, Italy—again the oft repeated wolf! wolf! of Communism! Here again, on the religious front at least, actually only the seething of a people pressing for freedom of spirit and freedom of mind . . . whether it gets this freedom within the Church or without!

What we have been saying about the religious revolution brings us to the all-important question: Is there any valid reason why we here in this country should sit back and do nothing, except stupidly cut off our own noses by fighting everything that the hysterical and the designing label Communism, leaving it to the agents of Russia to carry the banner of a belated religious revolution? Is there any valid reason why we should not be broadcasting to the world what America actually does stand for: a separation of Church and State that protects both state and school from dicta-

tion from *any* church, equality of all religious faiths, the right of every common man to approach his god in his own way? If we are not broadcasting these basic principles, how about getting busy and smoking out those (shall we call them the friends of Russian Communism?) who would stand in the way of a militant American leadership of this kind!

No small part of what is so hysterically called Communism today is thus merely a carrying on of the religious revolution that has become such an important ingredient in the making of the modern democratic world. But to this we have to add a second social revolution that is in essence no more Communist than the religious. It is that which we associate with those immortal words of July 4th, 1776:

> When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature's God entitle them . . .
>
> We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. . . .

These words suggest what the historian and sociologist call the *colonial revolution*—identical, socially, with the so-called Communist revolts that since the war have swept the whole of southeast Asia: Java and the Dutch East Indies, Malaya, French Indo-China, Burma (as well as China and the Philippines in so far as these countries are dependencies of foreign business interests). Stopping Communism in this part of the world has taken the questionable form of throwing our weight and quantities of military equipment into propping the tottering and, in many cases, tyrannical colonial regimes of the Dutch, the French, the British—thus repressing peoples who are driven by the same yearnings that impelled the Thirteen Colonies, with the towering George Washington at their head, to make war on England.

After the liberation from the Japanese, the Burmese colonials—to take Burma as a specific example of what I am describing—turned to the only leaders at hand (and you may be sure they were at hand!) revolutionists trained in the techniques of revolution in the International Lenin School in Moscow. These Communist leaders, with the independence fever running high in the late summer of 1946, were able to call 3,500 policemen out on strike, and with them the civil service workers, the railroad employes, the postal workers. Then followed the walkout of the employees of the Burma Oil Company, the Burma Trade Company, and of a "large steel corporation." The culmination was a general strike ordered by the all-Burma Trade Union Congress. All this, to the hysterical, was of course nothing but another Communist revolt! But exactly what it was revealed itself shortly after Sir Hubert Rance, governor of Burma, offered the independence party the control of the executive council. In the space of no less than three months after the granting of this large measure of independence, the Communists were snowed under so completely in a national election as to be all but frozen out. That is what happens to a so-called Communist revolution when the revolution is really a colonial revolution, and the colonial people wins its independence.

So once again, I ask—and I ask it in view of the fact that this country stands before the rest of the world today, not as the old-time imperialist Shylock bent on exacting his pound of flesh from weak and backward nations, but rather as the munificent Santa Claus dispenser of Marshall Plan anti-Communist billions—I ask: Is there any valid reason why the agents of Moscow should become the leading champions of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness among colonial peoples whose encouragement ought by all that is right and traditional here in America to be coming from the State Department, the Congress, the President of that nation which was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition of equality? This is not scatter-brained idealism. Today it is cold and stark realism. It is nothing less than survival.

In several parts of the world there is going on a third social revolution that in essence is no more Communist than the colonial or the religious. It is the revolution that we associate with the triumph of the American farmers under Andrew Jackson, a triumph that goes back to the revolt of the farmers in Massachusetts under Daniel Shay, and to the burning of the chateaus, the murdering of feudal overlords and the confiscation of their estates by the French peasants in the revolution of 1789. It was this revolution that made the American farmer a *farmer,* that saved him from becoming a mere peasant. As a farmer he wielded political power sufficient to safeguard his ownership of the land and protect him from the exploitation of would-be lords of the land. That this country has been the gainer, however despicable this revolt of the "furrow turners" may have seemed to the "better kind of people" in the late seventeen and early eighteen hundreds, no one in his right mind would ever think of questioning today.

However, when peasants or farmers in other parts of the world, a hundred years behind America in social and economic development, make identically the same attempt today, all we hear is the shriek, Communism!

If there were space and if the subject matter with which we have been dealing did not demand some kind of concluding vision of America leading a world in revolution, we might do more than give a few passing comments to the two remaining kinds of social revolution. Suffice it to say that one of these is what has been described as "the rising tide of color"—black people in South Africa and America; yellow and brown peoples in southern Asia. Their leaders and champions today are Communists primarily—and why? Is there any valid reason why America—what with the tremendous advances we have made and that we are now making in this direction—should not step in and take over?

Then again, and finally, there is the Socialist revolution of New Zealand, of England, of Norway, of Sweden—nations, all of them friendly democracies with whom we can do business, social laboratories that will give us the benefit of their trials and their errors; nations in none of which the Communist Party of Moscow has secured even as much as a toe hold! Here unquestionably is much to commend and nothing whatsoever to fear.

America rather than Russia is literally the natural born leader for a world in revolution. Towards this end we have already gone a long way—from the naive war-embracing of Mission-to-Moscow Russia, to the rude awakening that preceded the get-tough-with-Russia policy and to the present helping hand outstretched to non-Communist countries. But even this falls dangerously short of the dynamic and positive leadership that we must exert if we are to get the now

apathetic peoples of the world enthusiastically with us and behind us! All of which calls, as I have tried to indicate, for friendly encouragement of the Socialist democracies, a more positive position on the problems of the colored and the tinted, an active campaign to win over Mao Tze-tung and other leaders of the farmer-revolts, an active championship of the causes of the colonial peoples, a world-wide campaign to advertise the principles of the religious revolution in so far at least as they have become the basic law of the land.

But more than this: How American leadership could bring to the hungry and the hopeless, whose only sustaining hope today is the impossible Russian Communist dream, the vision of a new hope, is suggested by a tremendously significant development in Iran. There the Iranian government is setting aside the sum of $650,000,000; and they have invited a group of American engineers, chosen from eleven of the most outstanding engineering firms of the country, to come over and to turn the know-how that developed the most highly productive industry in the world, into working out a program, a great and breath-taking plan to increase their output of food, natural products, manufacturers, and thus to raise their standard of living.

If American know-how can do this—and there is no reason why not, and in a comparatively short space of time—why should not we go on and officially make available to any deserving country in the world not only the services of staffs of the best engineering minds but also such advances as may be necessary to take care of the financing? Costly—yes, but how infinitely cheaper than the cost of another war, either fighting it, or buying it off! And then again, how infinitely rewarding would it be to feel that peoples who were hungry and hopeless had taken on the new life that would come from having pointed out to them, by American surveys of their potentialities, the vision of what they might be able to do towards the realization of the good life of their dreams. How infinitely rewarding, not only for them, but for us!

Is Human Life Worth Saving?

EDWARD PODOLSKY

When Philip Carey, the hero in *Of Human Bondage,* was finally convinced that he had no kind of talent as an artist, he determined to study medicine. While the artist led a life reasonably filled with excitement, creating, glorifying, making permanent records of faces and scenes, the doctor's existence, though more humdrum and commonplace, was infinitely more useful. When Philip Carey became a doctor he felt that his greatest privilege was saving human lives. Carey was right. Doctors in real life also have had this idea for a great many hundreds of years. Somehow, the average medical man has always had a feeling that his work is almost on a par with the Creator's. God makes human lives; doctors preserve them.

For the most part the history of medicine is a glorious tale of the conquests of the evil forces of nature. Doctors have abolished the terrors of yellow and typhoid fevers, of malaria, of diphtheria, and most of the malignant diseases caused by bacteria. At the present time most of the bacterial diseases are well under control.

But the fight has not been only against microbial sickness and death. Doctors have made heartening advances in the realm of non-bacterial diseases. Within the past several decades the world has seen the conquest of diabetes with insulin, of certain forms of madness with electric shock, of pernicious anemia with liver, the remarkable improvement in Addison's and Paget's diseases under glandular treatment. Incurable diseases are becoming curable in quite a few instances.

Even more dramatic have been the contributions of physics to physic. The stilled heart has been shocked back to life. The paralysis-frozen chest has been made to breathe by means of the Drinker Respirator and the teeter-totter board has been used to stir the circulation back to living activity. Philip Carey had ideals. Most doctors have ideals. Human life is sacred to them and certainly well worth saving. They have proved by their actions what they have had as ideals.

But is the doctor's work really useful as we understand the term in its truest meaning? Can medicine really hope to prolong human life in the face of what man is doing to nullify his work? Is human life more secure now? Are the chances of longevity greater now than ever before?

The release of millions of human lives from bacterial extinction or death from diabetes or pernicious anemia can mean but one thing at present: the preservation of these lives for more horrible deaths. It means that where a man formerly died from typhoid fever the same man will die in an automobile accident. It means that where a man formerly was strangled to death by a swelling membrane in his throat caused by diphtheria, this same man will die in an airplane crash. It means that where a man formerly died of diabetes or tuberculosis, this man will die from the effects of an atomic bomb.

The task of the modern doctor in attempting to save human lives becomes greater in the face of modern technology and industrial progress. Doctors say that human lives are worth saving. Modern progress says that human lives must be sacrificed on the lap of the great god progress. This is the doctor's first discouragement.

Man is the cruelest, meanest, and most ferocious beast in the world. Nowhere in the animal kingdom is there a creature so stupid and so death-loving. Man is the eternal death-worshipper. He collects, invents, and idolizes instruments of destruction. He exercises his ingenuity in inventing new and more terrible death-dealing devices. His mind is fascinated by the thought that it is easier to destroy life than to preserve it. There is no quantity anywhere in the universe so cheap as human life.

Man has a brain. The brain is the source of ideas, of beliefs, of conceptions. These ideas and beliefs are often regarded as more valuable than human life itself. Millions have perished in the name of religion. Thousands have been killed in the name of science. Other millions have laid down their lives for economic ideals. Man, the death-worshipper, settles beliefs in economics and religion with war.

A clinic full of doctors may work for forty years to perfect means of prolonging human life and be successful, only to have their work nullified by a lone chemist working in a laboratory who has perfected a highly poisonous and diffusible gas which can wipe out a whole city of several millions in a short time.

Is human life worth saving under these conditions? Why should doctors work to perfect means of preserving human life when chemists and physicists are engaged in finding more effective means of destroying it? Why substitute God-dealt death with man-dealt death? Is there any sense to it at all?

The doctor is arrayed not only against the germs of the sub-visible world, but also against the modern, highly-skilled scientist who is making wholesale destruction of his fellow human beings his lifework.

Life is certainly becoming discouraging to the doctor of the present day. There are so many different kinds of death-dealers, that he finds that his work has become futile. While some sort of progress is being made in the direction of extending the span of human life, of abolishing disease, of making life a more interesting adventure, much more progress is being made in finding new and more ingenious ways of killing, of killing not in the hundreds but in the millions.

But doctors have been trained to work under the most discouraging conditions. There is, for instance, the case of the murderer, condemned to be executed. One week before his execution he is seized with acute appendicitis. An examination by the prison doctor reveals the fact that the appendix will burst if an operation is not performed at once. The doctor knows that the prisoner must be executed within a week. Does he say that an operation under these conditions will be futile? It is not for him to reason about the futility of his ministrations. It is his duty to save human life.

The murderer is put on the operating table. His appendix is removed as carefully as though he were a useful citizen of the community. He is nursed back to health as carefully as any patient in the hospital. Perhaps on the day of execution he has not entirely recovered. The execution must then be delayed. Two days later the prisoner is out of bed. His life has been saved through the work of the surgeon. But he is led to the execution chamber and put to death.

It is certainly not for the surgeon to question the usefulness of the operation. His duty is to save human life. He might have asked himself if human life was worth saving under these conditions. But he did not. And yet the average doctor knows that quite frequently outside of prison walls human beings are saved for an almost identical end.

Preventive medicine as it is now understood means the saving and prolonging of human lives not only by medical means. It means also the helpful cooperation of agencies outside the field of medicine. It means that the chemist, the physicist, the engineer, the statesman are exceedingly necessary allies of the doctor. In the problem of saving human lives it is no longer the germ which the modern doctor fears as much as human nature.

Although it seems quite an impossible task to get the cooperation of the other agencies in the saving of human lives, it is one that the average doctor thinks worth trying. It is not alone the physician who should be dedicated to the task of saving human lives but also the chemist, the engineer, the technologist.

Without the help of others it sometimes seems a rather hopeless task for the doctor to save human lives. Alcohol never killed as many people as bullets. Yet alcohol became the object of drastic prohibitionary measures, while it was and still is a comparatively easy matter to obtain a gun and bullets.

The saving of human lives demands the effective control of the destructive forces of modern life. Safety engineering is as important as germ killing in modern preventive medicine. In spite of all discouragements, human life must go on. It must be preserved. But the doctor cannot be alone in this fight. He must have help.

Religion and History—An Interpretation

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

No great religion can be divorced from the life of its founder. Gautama the Buddha, Jesus of Nazareth, Mohammed, all remind us that a powerful religious faith, springing from a movement within history, is bound up for good or ill with the great personality which brought it to birth and whose life affords one of the touchstones of its ultimate loyalties. The same thesis is also true of religious sects. Within Presbyterianism, the shades of John Calvin cast a lengthening shadow into the world of today. Methodism refuses to permit the personality of John Wesley to depart into its own age of two centuries ago. To some extent, Unitarianism demands the continued life of such past leaders as Channing, Parker, or Martineau. It is not always a bad thing that this attitude should prevail. Remembrance of past greatness is a continuing witness to the abiding value of human nature. It is a reminder that human nature, far from being a worthless thing only able to attain life through supernatural redemption, contains ranges of natural genius in the religious and moral spheres as well as in those of the intellect. Evil arises when the figure of the past is allowed to bind the future with a dead hand and to limit the field of its inquiry. As G. B. Foster pointed out at the Philadelphia Congress of Religious Liberals in 1909, the value of Jesus for the modern world lay solely in the extent to which he strove consciously to be like a goodness and love which already existed on earth.

Tradition assists the shaping of belief by reminding that religion must come to terms with history. Whatever may lie outside it, the actual theatre of revelation exists within the time-process as it has been shaped and rationalized by the racial consciousness. The view taken by any religion concerning the long centuries of history will go far towards determining its attitude toward individual personality living in the present. Christianity had a very definite view of the time-process, regarding it as illustrating the workings of an almighty and omnipotent Will. This belief in Will was combined with one which had faith in a transcendent Personality capa-

ble of determining the lot and destiny of history. It had rationalized and transformed into coherent philosophy the far-off religious beliefs of the primitive savage. God was the core of the whole universal order which he had created and which he transcends; the end of man, to quote the *Westminster Catechism,* is the glorification of God. God was an almighty potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords, regarding all the deeds of earth from his heavenly throne. He could interfere within history and transform those deeds at will. Miracles, whether of the New Testament, or of some later period, witnessed to the Divine power. History was therefore the revelation of the hand of God as he wrought deeds in conformity with his purpose. Even if man rebelled, his rebellion was futile in the last resort. He was but clay in the hands of an Almighty Potter who could mold at an omnipotent desire. The rebellion of man, when carried to the end, could lead to his condemnation to an eternal lake of everlasting fire. For the redeemed, the final end of history was a realm of eternal bliss.

The antique flavor which this view bears today only acts as a reminder that modernity must not be sought in past centuries. The world of Jesus was a world where angels brought good to pass and demons were the bearers of sickness and death; it was a twilight world of the supernatural where all mysteries were relegated to theological and mythological explanations; it was a world cut off, even in its own day, from the main streams of thought and culture. When it is recalled that witchcraft as a living and active belief only passed away in England at the end of the seventeenth century, it is unreasonable to expect to find historical Christianity in accord with those views which have come to be regarded as most fully interpretative of the modern world. The supernatural explanation is man's constant depository in which he places the many features of life for which he is unable to find an immediate and coherent explanation. In a world where knowledge tended to be slow of growth and where belief in an eternal and transcendent Omnipotence dominated the intellectual scene, it is not unnatural to find some such explanation of the time-process generally accepted. It is also worth recalling that it was an explanation which, on the whole, did not make for human happiness. Toleration was at a discount and the Inquisition illustrates the amount of tolerance which was accorded to the dissenter. The low and pessimistic view of human nature which the theory permitted allowed slavery to be sponsored by the church. Women, on a theory in part justifiable from the pages of the New Testament, were kept in subjection as chattels of men. Superstition, as the existence of witchcraft recalls, was one of the most prominent features of common life within a Christian society. Certainly, if only in the sphere of human well-being, the theory is open to the gravest pragmatic objections. Results of this type are to be expected when the view taken of human nature is blighted and conditioned by an ultimate pessimism, when man is regarded as the child of wrath rather than as the child of hope.

The great revolt of the modern world is that denoted by the rise of science. This revolution first took place in the seventeenth century when Descartes challenged the preceding transcendental theistic philosophies of the time-process by permitting man to commence his interpretation of the universe with "I think, therefore I am." The fruits of many increases in learning made during preceding centuries were becoming harvested and the mind of man was expanding enormously. At one stroke, Descartes had provided man with a philosophy within which his expanding mind could find expression and which placed him at the centre of the universe. The only view of God which could now be acceptable was intuitive and was to be sought out within man's own personal experiences and explorations. A God which could interest this viewpoint was a God, a life-force, acting in and through man. Descartes had struck a blow at the older theories of transcendence and had, in fact, given to them their first big defeat. He had thrown open the door to the evolution of a philosophy of modern science.

Succeeding centuries have brought this scientific revolution to the fullness of fruition. Vast increases of knowledge concerning the natural universe led to the far-reaching theory of biological evolution which insisted that man is at one with nature and is not a special creation. The work of Darwin and Huxley lay in the formulating of this theory and in the justifying of it from the evidence available. Evolutionary conceptions came to dominate every branch of knowledge, including literary and historical studies. Religious belief was found to have evolved; the Bible itself contained the story of one branch of this evolution. The mind of man had also evolved as increasing knowledge gave to him fresh experiences of life. Deepening experience and changing situations had led to an evolution of human conscience. The whole universe was one of growth in a steady, forward movement. Subsequent developments have done nothing to shake the two main positions which science then achieved. The scientific method insisted that the way to knowledge was through methods of comparison and experiment, thereby overthrowing the older dogmatism in theology and everywhere else. It also stressed an organic unity to life in which there was no room for the older dualism of God and man, sacred and secular, material and spiritual, implied by the former theologies. It is true that science has come to recognize its own necessary limitations, a point brought out by J. W. N. Sullivan. Having exchanged supernaturalistic explanations for those provided by a naturalistic science in every sphere of knowledge, it is forced to admit that there are certain boundaries which, at the moment, it is unable to cross. But this is not to say that one day they will not be crossed. Nor, because there is a vastness in the universe, implying certain ultimate mysteries, is it logical to suggest that they call for supernaturalistic explanations which have been defeated wherever it has been possible to bring them to the tests of comparison and experiment. Mysticism, for example, implies a suprarational sphere but it does not demand that this sphere is only explained adequately in the light of supernaturalism. The presumption is that the scientific method of comparison and experiment, together with its stress upon the organic unity of the universe, would provide an adequate explanation and technique could it be evolved and brought to bear upon the matter.

In short, there has been a revolt of modern man into a philosophy of Humanism. It is sometimes said, even by some Unitarians who should know better, that this revolt implies the death of religion and that there is a lack of logic in pleading for a worship, a deification, of truth, beauty, and goodness, which at the same time refuses to define them into the terms implied by the older forms of theistic supernaturalism. Humanists are charged with using the term God of certain qualities that have become revealed and rationalized through the evolution of the racial consciousness but thereby robbing

the term of all its meaning. No attitude could be more short-sighted or fundamentally mistaken. It seeks to identify the content of the religious emotions with certain definitions of religion thrown up by the changing vistas of human intuition. The religious conscience of mankind would thus be brought under the control of certain philosophies and definitions reached by past centuries; they would be given an autocratic authority over the future. Religion would tend to be wholly under the dominance of certain outstanding personalities which have arisen from time to time in former centuries. It is illogical, yet not always unknown, for some Unitarians to contend that the incipient Humanism and cautious liberalism of Channing represents the limits of inquiry to which they are willing to go. Yet this is only a specific example of an attitude to which the inquirer is committed inevitably if he learns to see the issues of religion and irreligion as those of supernaturalism in opposition to Humanism and if he refuses to permit religion to become defined anew in the light of those changing views of history and of life which the scientific revolution of the last century has brought to completion.

In the first place, a sharp distinction must be drawn between faith and belief as they co-exist within religious thought. Faith represents the turning of personality towards the highest moral and spiritual values envisaged by every factor of being. It is an attitude of human consciousness remaining constant throughout the ages, a quality of spirit which outward change does nothing to destroy even though it may lead to a raising of the standard of values acceptable to mind and conscience. To speak of faith is to speak of that which is not quantitative but qualitative within human consiousness and within the spirit of man. Whatever may be the formal definitions reached, it will remain as a determining element within the creation of individual personality. Religious belief is a term denoting a totally different matter. It represents the totality of quantitative beliefs reached at any one stage of social evolution through the impact of knowledge upon experience. The mind becomes stocked with various religious beliefs, some inherited and some acquired. A well-balanced and well-trained mind will retain some and will reject others, using comparison and experiment as its guide. By distinguishing between faith and belief, a reminder is given that, whilst faith has remained constant, beliefs have changed as a matter of fact from age to age. History constantly recalls the evolving nature of religious belief, showing as it does vast changes of emphasis and transitions on the part of man. There are no grounds for thinking that the beliefs of the present generation are final and that large changes will not gradually take place again as the future comes about.

But the scientific revolution implies a change of attitude on the part of religion towards its historic founders; man is presented by it with a different world to that which could be dominated by its great men of the past. It is an evolving world within which man is interested in the next step, in the next stage of the evolution of a cosmic consciousness explicit through the rationalized forms of the consciousness of the human race. Great figures of former ages may do much to guide by example but they do not afford fresh points of departure within history so much as a gathering of values of personality already present within humanity. They certainly cannot be permitted an autocratic control over the lives of the present generations of followers. For example, the position occupied by Jesus of Nazareth within any form of orthodox Christianity is profoundly unsatisfactory. Old doctrines of his Deity, of a co-existence of Jesus with God the Father, have broken down, and the numerous "modernist" lives of Jesus presented by semi-orthodox Protestant theologians bear witness to the fact. But, at the same time, the selfsame "modernist" writers are anxious to build up their human Jesus into something semi-supernatural, an archetype of humanity, or a repository for the whole of the moral and spiritual experience of the human race. In the eyes of Dr. H. E. Fosdick, Jesus is the greatest religious genius who has ever lived. But such names as Loisy, Guignebert, or Goguel, serve to recall that little or nothing is known of the actual life of Jesus and that any evidence for such a claim as that made by Dr. Fosdick and a host of other "modernists" is therefore wholly wanting. As Professor Elmer Barnes has cogently pointed out in his important book, *The Twilight of Christianity,* even much liberalized Christianity is still commonly expressed in terms of an unscientific and unhistorical "Jesus-stereotype" which shows it to be in bondage implicitly to authoritarian views of history and to the binding control of certain great figures of the past. A religion in line with scientific advance must break with this position for good and all. Its immediate concern is with the man of today and with the many problems, both factual and moral, which perplex his life but which were utterly unknown to Jesus in many cases. Jesus has a relevance in so far as he strove consciously to portray goodness in his own life but his actual moral solutions were based upon a universe conditioned by the direct intervention of God and by the interplay of angels and demons. Religion owes to the man of today an interest relating his experiences of the universe as a whole to those of others engaged in a similar quest, to find the expression of his individuality within a more cooperative form of society. As reinterpreted by the scientific revolution, religion has ceased to see the true end of man in the glorification of a transcendent God but finds its final scope within the deepest spiritual experiences of the individual man. Being so concerned, it is bound to seek a relationship of those experiences with a social order attempting cooperation and attempting to bring the individual into harmony with the whole universe. Seeking this end, it is forced to turn from all that makes for autocracy over the individual and to search out the free self-expression of the individual mind and conscience.

This search for a greater cooperation between man and man, leading to a greater interplay between the individual spirit and those forces of natural law forming the outer aspects of the universal order, leads on to another realization. The scientific revolution, redefined in terms of religious belief, makes for organic unity and stresses the final oneness of the universal order. Older forms of dualism lie outside its comprehension or acceptance. It regards the evolution of the universe and the unfolding of life upon this planet as a unified process, a revelation through the forces of life of the only Deity which it can know. Looking out over the wide span of the history of the human race, it sees the moral touchstones of truth, beauty, and goodness, as emerging gradually through the racial consciousness, becoming increasingly refined, related anew to constant changes of stress and outlook. As the mind of man has become provided with more durable weapons for the purpose, he has gained deeper glimpses into the meaning of reality and greater visions of truth. His knowledge has

been increased enormously and has enabled him to come to a wider understanding of the universe. History gives little or no grounds for believing that the time-process is capable of being interpreted in the light of sporadic interruptions by transcendent Deity through miracle or sign. Various miracle-stories have come into being under pre-scientific conditions. There are, for example, those of the New Testament or those of St. Francis of Assisi. But a weighing of evidence for their factual happening within history does not lend confidence to their being other than legend. The whole universe is seen to be a unified process within which man is at one with nature. A realization of the implications of this point forces a fundamental redefinition of what is meant by God. The old transcendent views of an eternal personality, derived from an Oriental Sultan and his court, have gone forever. Man is driven to a search for his moral absolutes within the life-force, found in nature as a whole and attaining rationality within the spirit of man. In short, Humanism has justified itself by forcing the seeking out of God in and through man as the highest manifestation of will and power that can be known.

A religion redefined by science gives confidence concerning individual seeking and concerning the spirit revealed in man as the revelation of all that can be meant by Deity. It is an implicit condemnation of the pessimistic view of human nature taken by classic religion and re-echoed at the present time by writers of the outlook of Reinhold Niebuhr. History may illustrate vast moral relapses on the part of man; the present moment is such a phase. But although the waves of moral progress seem at first sight to be making no inroads as they break upon the shores of human life, yet steadily and invisibly man is evolving in many directions and is thereby making vast moral progress possible. The history of humanity is an illustration of the manner in which the individual has reacted toward the universe as a whole and toward other individuals. It illustrates man's growing search for a greater world-harmony and a greater spirit of cooperation than has hitherto existed. Despite his many relapses, the view of man to which science leads is one which does not yield the pessimism of St. Paul, of the Catholic Church, and of orthodox Protestantism but a valid and chastened hope for the future.

The progress of modern science, in physical and natural science as well as in other directions, enforces a totally fresh view of human history. A process of redefinition must fit religion into this world view. Fundamentally, religion is dealing with certain emotions and cosmic experiences on the part of the individual as he faces the universe. These experiences remain unchanged even though they need to be expressed afresh under the forms of a relevant Humanism rather than an irrelevant supernaturalism. Man is forced to seek out his absolutes anew within the human consciousness, to find them revealed in and through the life-force, to see them as impregnating the whole universe with meaning. The universe and its history is no longer capable of explanation at contemporary levels of knowledge and experience in terms of the breaking through of transcendent Deity in catastrophic form into the time-process. Man is forced to stand upon his own feet and make his own way in the world. The vague power of example in moral attitude is all that the great founders and leaders of the past can teach him even though organized religion is so closely allied to its former great figures in bygone centuries. But man is not the loser; his religious experiences are not impoverished by the change. He is the more ennobled, for he has laid upon his human nature a high estimate of his ultimate worth within time and a high calling to discipleship as he estimates his individual personality in its relationships to the universe in the light of the interpretations laid upon it by a Humanist view of religion.

How Free Is Our Press?

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

More than a year ago, the Commission on the Freedom of the Press under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert Hutchins, Chancellor of the University of Chicago, made its report to the nation on the condition of the American press. It was a thorough, scholarly, and highly critical report, one that minced no words in castigating the many faults and weaknesses of our news-gathering and news-distributing agencies and one that made a number of constructive and practical suggestions as to reforms needed in the newspaper world and methods to achieve these.

Our citizens would do well to read and ponder this report, not only because of its realistic approach to the whole problem of a democratic press, but also because of its implicit admission that the American press is probably as free and independent a news service as can be found anywhere. This is important, less so because it may make us proud and complacent than because it effectively gives the lie to those voices in our midst that find in any comparison between our press and that of Soviet Russia a welcome occasion for praising the latter and damning the former.

The *New Leader* published two extensive comments on the Commission's report, one by George N. Shuster, President of Hunter College of the City of New York, and another by Ferdinand Lundberg, author of a biography of William Randolph Hearst and other volumes. Just as random opinions, I quote from Dr. Shuster's "How Free Are Our Newspapers?" as follows: "The principal point made in the general report was that distribution of the mass media of communication is not considered a panacea for the ills from which the 'press' as a whole suffers." And from Mr. Lundberg's "Pressure Groups and the News," this quotation: "I think it is true that an infantile public gets precisely what it will take in its press. If it gets pap instead of good red meat it is because it wants pap, which more or less cynical publishers are willing to supply."

It has become a popular pastime among pseudo-liberals, radicals, Communists and their fellow travelers to try to impress the American people with the alleged "fact" that most of their institutions, including the press, are woefully inadequate and imperfect when compared with their counterparts in Communist Russia. Of late even religious journals, from which one would expect a greater degree of justice and fair-mindedness, have been sounding off on this theme in the accepted tonality *à la Moscow*. We are being told that the American press is not free because it is not completely

free, whatever that may mean. Of course, many of the criticisms directed against our newspapers by Communist and other secular as well as religious journals are well-taken and in substance correct; but it must be emphasized that even if every imperfection of our press, so bitterly assailed and censured by its detractors, were corrected, the ideal of a completely free press, as held up by these critics of our newspapers, would still remain "a far-off divine event." It is rather amusing to contemplate that it is precisely these critical editors and their associates whose journalistic standards fall far short of the ideal of that complete freedom which they so eloquently endorse for the "wicked capitalist press" of our land. Just what would a completely free press mean anyway, and what is gained in this controversy by dragging into the arena of legitimate debate regarding the faults and failings of our newspapers those "counsels of perfection" which nobody, whether he be an honest editor or an honest reader, expects to see realized?

You would think that especially a Communist or a fellow traveler would hesitate before accusing the American press of being subject to "capitalist control," of being dominated by moneyed interests, of being subservient to political machines. Just what is there that is so free and uncontrolled about the press in Soviet Russia that it is always being used as a standard and measuring rod for the press of particularly the democratic countries? Can the reader name one organ of Soviet opinion, whether newspaper, journal of art or science, or any literary magazine that is actually free to publish what it pleases in the way it pleases? Do they not all, without exception, take their directives from the Politburo, from the party hierarchy, and from the approved "line"? How can an honest person speak with a straight face of independent writing or a free press in a country where the secret police is ever on the alert for the slightest sign of insubordination, party irregularity, and counter-revolutionary tendencies in the printed as well as in the spoken word? That the Soviet press is a tool of the Soviet State is too obvious for proof or documentation; and certainly such a controlled press, free only to mouth party shibboleths and to parrot ideological propaganda, can be called a free press only by hypocrites or morons.

On the other hand, it is only fair to admit that the American press is about as free as the press in any democracy can be that labors under the common disabilities of our imperfect human nature and of our immature social institutions. Our press needs plenty of improvement. It badly needs reform at the top and at the bottom. But even at its worst it is so infinitely more free and independent than the press of Soviet Russia that any comparison must appear quite ridiculous. Our most vociferous critics of the alleged enslavement and subservience of our press are in fact the ablest, although unwilling, defenders of the actual freedom of our newspapers, for their unhampered activity as accusers and opponents of our so-called unfree press proves that the American journalistic scene is free enough to permit the most violent opposition and most scathing censure of existing practices of news-gathering and news-printing. Nowhere is this more true than in the case of those religious journals that are regularly berating our newspapers for their enslavement to privilege and wealth. Were our press not free, could these journals exist and voice their opinions as violently and persistently and, alas, as prejudicially as they often do?

The American reader has at all times a wide and free choice among hundreds of papers, journals, magazines, etc., all of which invite him from newsstand and subscription office to buy and read; none of which compel him to do either or both. Has a reader anything like such a choice in Russia? In New York, you pay from three cents to fifty or more for anything from the most reactionary newspaper to the most liberal mouthpiece of progressive opinion or radical ideology, including the *Daily Worker* and the *Masses.* No one compels anyone to buy or to read. If you choose to read Mr. William Randolph Hearst's dailies, you are free to do so; if you prefer the *New Leader,* the choice is yours, and there is no secret police around to arrest you. In the realm of religious journalism, the reader may do the same; he has a wide selection among the most conservative church organs and the most outspokenly liberal or radical ones. Where else except in the truly democratic countries do you find such or greater freedom to print and to read? No one knows better than the gentry which delights to foul its own nest that an opposition press in Russia or in her satellite countries is unthinkable; here it is taken for granted. It would be difficult to imagine greater freedom of the press anywhere than that which exists in a land where, definite control and even monopoly of certain newspaper chains by special interests nothwithstanding, the masses of readers have as much liberty of choice as we have in America.

Is the American press a tool of reaction, a willing servant of special privilege and business interests? Yes, it often is, but it is also true that we readers have the remedy in our own hands. We can refuse to buy and read; we can boycott; and we can patronize those newspapers that serve the community and speak out for democracy and the social weal. If a portion of our press howls for war with Russia, who compels us to read such nonsense or to agree, while we have numerous journals that speak in tones of statesmanship and sanity? Let us stop exaggerating the evils of our free and democratic press. It is far from perfect, and quite likely never will be completely free. But you and I are the ones to decide which it is to be, free or unfree. *We* are the makers and readers of our press; we can have it cheap and vulgar, or of high quality and truly democratic. And today, as we scan the columns, editorial or news, of Soviet papers like *Pravda, Isvesztia,* or *Trud,* even the novice in journalism knows that the American press operates on an infinitely higher level of reliability, news reporting, news interpreting, and editorializing than any newspaper or magazine of our Russian friends. Indeed, making all allowances for the human fallibilities of our democratic institutions, we *have* a free press; and instead of seeking to demean and cheapen its function, we would do better to treasure it highly as a bulwark of liberty that will serve our people in the measure that they remain both alert to its imperfections and appreciative of its many virtues and excellencies.

APPEAL

A reader desires the issue of UNITY dated February 15, 1932. If anyone chances to have this issue and would forward it to this office, the courtesy will be appreciated.

Is Science Good for Man?

R. C. MULLENIX

Prior to fifty years ago this would have been a ridiculous question. But after World War I, with its unprecedented destructive mess, made possible by the inventions of science, there was a widespread demand that "science take a holiday." The usual answer, in which I joined, was: What we need is more science.

Then after a recess of twenty years, came World War II, with its flame throwers, its jet-propelled bombs, and finally the atom bomb. And we witnessed the collapse of our materialistic culture, the wreckage of four centuries of progress, the fruitage of the Age of Science. And again we are confronted with the question: Should science take a holiday? Is science, after all, good for man?

And my answer is the same as it was thirty years ago: We need not less science, but more. But it must be a new science—a science for the new epoch in human history upon which we enter, the Atomic Age; a science not so predominantly a science of things, but a new science of the spirit—the mind and heart and will of man, a new Biology of Man.

It is a common boast that there was more of human progress in the nineteenth century than in all the preceding centuries of the Christian Era. This gave to man a completer mastery of the environment, a completer power of prediction and control over the forces of nature than could have been conceived a century ago. But our social progress, our gain in social self-control, has been comparatively slow, often doubtful.

Will Durant has recently declared that in the six years between the outbreak of World War II and Hiroshima there was as much advance in military destructiveness as in the 593 years between the Battle of Cressy in 1346 and 1939.

What now is to be the goal, the guiding star, the philosophy, of the science of the New Era upon which we enter? Is it to be the advancement of science for its own sake, or for the Glory of Man, the promotion of human welfare and happiness?

From the days of Galileo, Newton, and Copernicus to the time of Edison, Einstein, and Urey, scientists have labored to discover the laws that are imbedded within the nature of things, in order that we may conform our lives to them and utilize them for the promotion of human welfare. They have devoted their energies to the tasks of discovery and invention, and have turned over to their fellow men the fruits of their labors to use as they chose. No scientist, of course, can anticipate the uses to which his discoveries and inventions will be put, but to the extent to which man uses the fruits of science to enlarge, enrich, and make more satisfying the lives of men and women, to that extent science is good for man. To the extent that science has dwarfed or degraded or embittered human life, to that extent science has been bad for man. That is to say, whether science is good for man or not depends upon the use he makes of the power put into his hands by the researches and inventions of science, pure and applied.

At this moment in history we find ourselves with the atom bomb on our hands, and no one knows what to do with or about it. And upon the answer to that question depends, in no small degree, the solution of the international problems which vex the minds of politicians, soldiers, scientists, statesmen, and philosophers.

In view of the present world situation it is becoming increasingly obvious to scientists and non-scientists alike that the time has come when men of science must devote themselves not only to discovery and invention, but must concern themselves as they have not heretofore done with the use that men make of the products of their toil. The scientist was a man before he was a scientist, and his responsibility for the well-being of his fellow men must take priority over his obligations in the field of his specialized interests, whether it be in discovery or invention.

I find no fault with the scientists who produced the atom bomb. They were virtually under government draft to undertake the creation of a new weapon for the humane purpose of bringing the war to a speedy end and saving the lives of untold thousands of our soldiers.

But in consideration of the situation consequent upon what I now regard as the blunder, if not the crime, of Hiroshima, I venture the assertion that it is questionable whether it is possible for a man to be a good human being and *voluntarily* work on the development of new instruments of war, of ever-increasing destructiveness.

Before embarking upon professional practice all physicians swear a solemn oath—the oath of Hippocrates—that they will not take improper advantage of their position, but will always remember their responsibilities to suffering humanity. In a recent issue of the *Scientific Monthly* there was published an article by an eminent scientist in which he proposed that scientists and technicians take a similar oath in some such words as these: "I pledge myself that I will use my knowledge for the good of humanity and against the destructive forces of the world and the ruthless intent of men; and that I will work together with my fellow scientists for these our common ends." Among the papers presented at the nuclear science section of the Bicentennial Celebration of Princeton University was a scholarly and moving appeal to scientists to "meet the vast increase in power conferred on them by nuclear research, by establishing a control upon themselves analogous to that of the Hippocratic oath, self-imposed by the medical profession."

It is to be hoped that many individual scientists will take a negative stand against war by refusing to collaborate in any project whose avowed purpose is the destruction or enslavement of human beings. Not only as individuals, but through their professional organizations, scientists and technicians have it in their power to do a great deal to direct the planning of future research and invention toward the achievement of humane and reasonable ends.

There is gratifying evidence that many scientists are recognizing that from now on they must concern themselves as they have not heretofore done with the use that man makes of the fruits of their labors. A new magazine has been launched by physicists Goldsmith and Rabinowitch, of Columbia University and the University of Illinois respectively, advocating a new

recognition of the responsibility of scientists to humanity. Diplomats, scientists, and philosophers in practically all countries are subscribers. British, French, and Japanese as well as American authors have appeared in its columns. The circulation of the magazine is growing rapidly. Recent issues of the magazine have carried much discussion from the conscience angle. A recent article is from the French philosopher, Jacques Maritain, who says: "The scientist is requested by the very development of science to assume his own responsibilities, as a man and as a citizen, in the political field."

As we move forward into the Atomic Era it is prerequisite to a New Age of Progress that there be a juster reconciliation of competition and cooperation; a completer synthesis of the realism of science and the idealism of religion; a readier acceptance of the "handicap of ethical considerations"; a completer balancing of the egoism inherent in the nature of man and the altruism, the sacrificial spirit, that is the kernel of all high religion. This is the unconquered frontier of a new Society of Man upon the earth.

The achievement of these ends depends upon the leadership of common men by uncommon men richly endowed in brain and heart. It is up to men of science —researchers, inventors, and expositors—recognizing the Unity of Science, the Unity of Man, the Unity of the World, to take their place in the front ranks of opinion-forming minds.

Thus may be made less remote the realization of Tennyson's dream of a "Parliament of Man, a Federation of the World." Thus may men of science help to solve the problem that is proving to be so difficult of solution, the problem of World Government.

The Study Table

Rugged Pietist

NOT AS THE WORLD GIVETH. *A Book of Meditations by Philippe Vernier. Translated by Edith Lovejoy Pierce. New York: Fellowship Publications. 96 pp. $1.50.*

Philippe Vernier, like Mr. Roberts, seems to be one of those leaders who leads so well because he never looks behind him to see if anyone is following. At least this is the impression a reviewer gets from the Foreword to this book by Edith Lovejoy Pierce. She claims to have found nothing less than "the Kingdom of Heaven" in the Reverend Mr. Vernier's Belgian parish. From her we learn that Vernier's voice seems "to impose peace," and that he is "the most unselfconscious person" she has ever known. There are other things about him that are much more impressive than his translator's effulgent gushings.

For one thing, Vernier is only in his middle thirties. He serves and preaches among the children and coal miners of an obscure Belgian village. He seems to have a good deal of the St. Francis in him, mixed well with a stubborn masculinity that turned months of imprisonment as an absolute pacifist to highly productive literary use. The meditations contained in the present volume were written on scraps of paper smuggled into his prison cell, and then smuggled out again. He escaped execution by about the same hair's-breadth that saved Tom Paine. What is perhaps most important of all to the world outside his Belgian village, he writes very well. It would be necessary to accept Vernier's religious frame of reference to be stirred by his content. That frame of reference is a stout Christocentric pietism, which this reviewer does not relish, but that fails to dampen an aesthetic appreciation of the vital beauty of what he has to say of such matters as Love, Faith, and Humility.

Vernier is a star on the horizon of modernist Christians of the slightly mystical variety. He is not a mystic, though he appeals to the mystically inclined. He is a good, rugged pietist, motivated by unimpeachable convictions. The world is certainly no worse a place because Vernier plies his pastor's trade so vigorously and effectively among his Belgian parishioners, and writes meditations for a much larger but equally appreciative public.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Primitive Culture

MAGIC, SCIENCE AND RELIGION, AND OTHER ESSAYS. *By Bronislaw Malinowski. Introduction by Robert Redfield. Boston: Beacon Press. 327 pp. $3.50.*

This is a fine study of savage or primitive culture. It is good both for beginners in anthropology and for experts. It is easy to read, and there is much in it that everybody ought to know.

Malinowski has made extensive on-the-spot studies of the culture of the Melanesian natives in the Trobriand Islands northeast of New Guinea. He describes many aspects of their culture in fascinating detail.

He shows how savages accept a great mass of beliefs which we can see are ridiculous. But he denies the theory of Levy-Bruhl that in their thought primitive men violate the basic principles of reasoning and the law of identity. Malinowski says that every primitive community has a considerable store of knowledge based on experience and reason. They have few abstract ideas. They cannot formulate general principles of causation or space and time. But their beliefs about the supernatural are "an extensive and coherent scheme —a great organic unit." The function of myth, he says, is to give tradition more prestige by showing its high supernatural origin.

He includes an interesting study of primitive language. He shows that the meanings of expressions in such a language cannot be understood apart from the whole culture. He rightly protests at the survival, in civilized times, of the primitive tendency to identify a word with what it means. He is much influenced by Ogden and Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning,* and he has no grasp whatever of the Aristotelian concept of the definition of abstract ideas and class terms. However, he tacitly assumes Aristotelian universals when he says that "man's essential nature is identical," meaning we are all, savage and civilized, basically alike.

In his final section on war he recognizes that wars of conquest have done much good in the diffusion of culture. But the only good war now would be one to end all war. He thinks we can have a world community without war. He hates to admit that pugnacity is an instinct, but he admits that it cannot be eliminated from human life. It must be canalized into creative directions.

GARDNER WILLIAMS.

Dynamic of Service

THE QUAKER MESSAGE. *Compiled by Sidney Lucas. Wallingford, Pennslyvania: Pendle Hill. 90 pp. Twenty-five cents.*

Nearly two thousand years of Christian history have failed rather miserably to reproduce the spirit of Jesus in institutional form. The Christian accompaniments of provincialism, exclusiveness, and militant evangelism have travelled far from the meditative and compassionately humble personality of Christianity's "Son of God." One of the heartening and glowing exceptions to this discouraging rule has been modern Quakerism, the contemporary Society of Friends. We cannot say this has always been so of the Quakers. George Fox was as certain that he had *the* Way and *the* Message as was Knox or Calvin. But the intervening years and the crush of intense tragedy in our modern world has done much to distill from Quakerism elements that are preëminently admirable in the confused religious scene of our time.

This little volume is an attempt to state the Quaker position systematically by drawing from the writings of representative Quakers over a period of three hundred years. Any attempt at making an orderly arrangement of the values and beliefs of a religious group is to be commended. This one comes off rather better than a recent attempt by Warren H. Johnson to do the same sort of thing with the utterances of modern Unitarian clergymen, mainly, I believe, because Lucas' plan and outline are more comprehensive and deal more with what those quoted really think than with what they say from the pulpit for congregation consumption. This all too present and unfortunate gap in religious circles between honest thought and diplomatic utterance can to some degree be assessed against the Quakers, however, as against the Unitarians.

It is difficult for me to believe, for instance, that many of my Hicksite Quaker friends can really go along with the neo-Arian view of Jesus expounded in the Lucas compilation. In terms of our present critical knowledge of the New Testament history and origins neo-Arianism hardly meets the needs of modern intelligence. On the other hand I fail to see how it would satisfy an Iowan Quaker fundamentalist either. Apparently it is an attempt to please everybody which, in the long run, never seems to be possible.

There is much in this book to warm the heart of F. S. C. Northrop and his devotees. Quakerism has taken to its bosom, with sincerity, much of the contemplative and intuitional genius of the Orient. But it has certainly failed to meet his other requirement of a reformation in its theoretical component. The theological content of Quakerism still draws its strength from the very assumptions that Northrop declares to be moribund and hopelessly inadequate for the religion of a citizen in whom the East and West meet gladly and peaceably.

Still and all, the sections of the book which deal with society and the world substantiate the well-known Quaker dynamic of service, and remind us again of the growing debt owed by decent people everywhere to the practical "witness" of the Society of Friends.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

The Majority Problem

AMERICA DIVIDED. *By Arnold and Caroline Rose. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 342 pp. $4.00.*

"The mere fact of being generally hated because of religious, racial, or nationality background is what defines a minority group." That sentence is on the first page and lets the reader know what is being discussed.

"Hate" in the context of minority group discussion is a better word than "prejudice." It is more honest. It makes clear the *fact* that the problem of the minority lies in the majority and not in the minority. The Negro problem is really a white man's problem, and the Jewish problem is really a Gentile problem.

This book deals with all the minorities in the United States—Catholics and Jews, no less than Negroes and Mexicans. It is a coherent and systematic discussion of the entire minority problem. The term minority

(*Continued on page 38*)

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page 22*)

strictive methods and procedures that have been adopted actually are."

The problem of applying proper safeguards is complicated, he points out, by confusion over labels. In the absence of any official definition of such terms as "subversive," "un-American," "Communist," or "fellow traveler," there has been "a strong and constant temptation" to pin such labels on anyone whose "political or economic opinions are more radical or liberal than our own."

In spite of the immense problems involved, Dr. Cushman finds that there has been no hysterical witch-hunting in the enforcement of the President's Loyalty Order for federal employees. He notes that "for the first time an orderly procedure has been established for reviewing the cases of employees accused of disloyalty." Nevertheless, he points out that not all of the traditional American safeguards for the individual have been preserved in this procedure: (1) accused employees are not permitted to confront their accusers; (2) the principle of "guilt by association" is applied in the use of membership lists of certain blacklisted organizations as a criterion of loyalty.

While suspending judgment on the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Dr. Cushman points out that normal judicial safeguards have been lacking in its procedure. The Committee, for instance, has never defined in any satisfactory way what it means by "subversive" or "un-American," and this has left it free to pin the badge of disloyalty on a large number of patriotic citizens and distinguished persons who have advocated political, economic, or social reforms of which members of the Committee do not approve.

With a view to giving every citizen a better understanding of the basic American freedoms, the pamphlet contains a detailed analysis of the federal Bill of Rights and the safeguards afforded by the states.

Despite current threats, Dr. Cushman finds that considerable progress has been made in recent years as a result of Supreme Court decisions in clarifying, broadening, and strengthening our civil liberties and placing them more squarely under judicial protection.

The Study Table

(*Continued from page 37*)

problem is better than the usual "race problem" for "there is no *scientific value* in referring to any group of people in the United States as a race."

The term race is a biological term whereas this book deals almost entirely with social problems.

The two chapters, "Race Differences" and "The Psychology of Prejudice," should be read by all who are truly concerned about a decent society.

This book is a sign of the times. Many social scientists are working to develop a science of human relations. The fact is that we do not know the causes of prejudice, or how it develops. We have not, so far as I know, a single case history of prejudice.

So, we do not know how to combat prejudice (hatred) effectively. That is why the National Conference on Christians and Jews is financing projects in intergroup education. We need facts and more facts, and we need techniques which only trained scientists can provide.

I have not space for an adequate review of such an important and timely book. I hope that I may call it to the attention of some teacher or minister or civic leader. We must all realize that our mistreatment of minorities is a terrible scar on our democracy as we face the new world that is coming so fast.

JAMES M. YARD.

Accurate Psychiatric Discussion

PSYCHIATRY AND RELIGION. *By 15 American Authorities. Edited by Joshua Loth Liebman. Boston: Beacon Press. 202 pp. $3.00.*

Most liberal clergymen make their peace with Sigmund Freud without bothering to understand him. Most orthodox clergymen declare war on Sigmund Freud without bothering to understand him. Joshua Loth Liebman made his peace with Sigmund Freud by finding out what the Viennese genius was talking about. The cause of liberal religion suffered a real blow last June when Rabbi Liebman died.

His was truly a solid and compelling voice. Occasionally it seemed as if Liebman struggled to turn a phrase just a bit too neatly. At times he almost appeared to pontificate, which was not becoming in one so young. But he did what few liberal clergymen have had the intellectual tenacity to do. He really set out to find what psychiatry had to offer to religion. There was nothing superficial about his effort; it was an honest, scholarly search seasoned by his own willingness to submit to the soul-searching agonies of personal psychoanalysis.

No one with anything less than Liebman's grasp of the religio-psychiatric relationship could have envisaged the scope and plan of the Temple Israel Institute on Religion and Psychiatry. In designing this two-day conference of religious leaders of New England and distinguished psychiatrists and psychoanalysts, Rabbi Liebman expressed the hope that "the sanctuary and the laboratory might be mutually helpful." Fortunately the Beacon Press was alive to the value of publishing the proceedings of this Institute for widespread benefit and appreciation. The result is a volume that covers a significantly wide area of subject matter in the varied rhetorical styles of fifteen qualified clergymen, psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts, including Dr. Liebman himself.

It is a good book and it deserves to be read widely—especially by those clergymen who have recently learned how to lure larger congregations by giving their sermon titles a psychiatric twist. It is sad but all too true that a little psychiatric knowledge can be a dangerous thing, both to a clergyman and his congregation. There is accurate psychiatric discussion in this volume, and there is an incisive examination from some healthily divergent points of view of the places at which psychiatry and religion meet, and part.

The Institute left two exceedingly vital areas untouched, perhaps for good and sufficient reason. They are the areas that might have been entitled: "A Psychiatric Examination of Pastoral Motives," and "The Dynamic Effects on Parishioners of the Clergyman-Image." Mention of these omissions is not meant, however, as criticism of the publication. This volume is a worthy tribute to the memory of Joshua Loth Liebman, a great religious liberal and a true pioneer.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Correspondence

In Reply to Mr. Yarros

TO UNITY:

I was disappointed with Mr. Yarros' article in your March-April issue. It is certainly easy to become intolerant toward the New Testament record of Jesus, but intolerance is not usual in Unitarianism. I consider Mr. Yarros' article somewhat intolerant, although I sympathize in the main with his desire to reveal the human qualities of Jesus, to get Jesus down out of the clouds, as it were.

It seems to me that the record of Jesus' life was compiled too far away, in point of time, to pin him down with single words or phrases, to aver that Jesus actually said this or that. To be sure, we have the broad picture of the man in the Gospels. And this picture as brought out by devout but scientific historical research leaves us, I believe, with a highly moral picture of a prophet with a refined message of religion.

So, I do not believe we should pay too much attention to the account of the water-wine episode, for example. At any rate, we need to avoid the mistake of needlessly wounding the sensibilities of devout Christians, unless we have the established findings of historical research on which to found our assertions soundly.

Mr. Van Gundy uses the phrase, "the spirit of Jesus," which I interpret to mean the broad outlines of his teachings and life as they are brought out by the brush of historical research. We shall only wound sensibilities, and hurt the cause of Truth if we place Jesus in the seat of the scornful, or as an actual hater of father and mother.

I am tempted to the opinion that Mr. Yarros has written an article on "Jesus: Without Imagination." It is the letter that still killeth, the spirit that still giveth life.

ROBERT W. LUCE.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

ANNUAL SESSIONS NOTABLE SUCCESS

The Annual Meetings of the Western Unitarian Conference were an outstanding success. Dr. Eduard C. Lindeman, the Conference lecturer, in his three talks on "The Disciplines of Democracy," proved to be most stimulating and thought provoking. The simple directness of Lindeman's presentation made his points unusually clear. The popularity of Dr. Lindeman, the success of his lectures, and the general participation of the delegates in the discussion would indicate that this type of program should be used again sometime.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

The meetings opened with the first of two scheduled business sessions. Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Conference, appointed to the Credentials Committee Mrs. W. E. Roberts of People's Liberal Church, Chairman; Mrs. C. A. Schaad of the Conference Office, and Mr. Harry Burns of Cincinnati. To the Business or Resolutions Committee were appointed Rev. Aron Gilmartin, of Fort Wayne, Chairman; Rev. Ellsworth Smith of Cincinnati, Rev. Robert T. Weston of Louisville, and Mrs. Harold Abbott of Beverly Church, Chicago. Following the welcome to the Conference by Rev. William D. Hammond, minister of People's Liberal Church, and the committee appointments the Secretary gave his annual report.

The Secretary emphasized the growing strength of our churches, the growing high quality of our ministers, and the growing need for increased responsibility. A tribute was paid to Mr. Delta I. Jarrett, former President and Treasurer of the Conference, who died on February 22 of this year. Attention was called to two outstanding events of the year in the Unitarian Movement, the publication by the Beacon Press of the book, *American Freedom and Catholic Power,* by Paul Blanshard, and the Fellowship Unit program. Six Fellowship Units now exist within, and as a part of, the Western Unitarian Conference. They are:

Boulder, Colorado
Ames, Iowa
Bloomington, Indiana
Lafayette, Indiana
Bowling Green, Ohio
Birmingham, Michigan

The Boulder Fellowship was the first Unit organized in the country under the new program.

MINISTERS AND ALLIANCE

The Alliance Workshop was led by Mrs. D. Gilman Taylor of Minneapolis, Vice-President of the General Alliance. It was devoted primarily to local problems raised by the participants, such as how to interest young women, how to contribute to the life of the church in ways other than raising money, serving dinners, and housekeeping, and how to meet or supplement the competition of the League of Women Voters, Parent Teachers Association, and other community organizations.

The ministers' meeting was led by Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, minister of the St. Louis Unitarian Church and President of the Unitarian Ministers' Association. Among the matters discussed was a resolution prepared by Dr. Wallace W. Robbins for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the ministers in Boston. The resolution dealt with the code of conduct for ministers and their relationship to people in parishes other than their own. It recommended procedures for determining violations and penalties. No action was taken on the resolution other than suggesting certain changes in wording.

Rev. Randall S. Hilton, Secretary of the Conference, presented certain amendments to the By-Laws of the American Unitarian Association which had been prepared at the request of the Board of the Conference. The major changes had to do with the abolishing of the office of Vice-President and providing for nomination by the regional areas to the Board of the Association. This was unanimously approved.

The meeting was attended by the largest number of ministers present at a Western Conference Annual Session in many years.

HISTORICAL SOCIETY

At the dinner meeting Friday evening, May 6, the program of the Historical Society was presented. Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, President, presided. Rev. Kenneth C. Walker gave a paper on "The Beginnings of the Unitarian Church in Bloomington, Illinois," of which he is the minister. The dinner was served by the women of the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship.

STODDARD, BANQUET SPEAKER

The Saturday banquet, served by the women of People's Liberal Church, was so well attended it was necessary to move the program into the church auditorium. Mr. Malcolm Knowles, Director of Adult Education for the Chicago Y.M.C.A. and a member of the Evanston Church, was Toastmaster. Toasts were given by Rev. Max Gaebler, Davenport; Rev. Arnold Westwood, Urbana; and Rev. Fred Cairns, Madison. Dr. Raymond B. Bragg, former Secretary of the Conference and now Director of the Unitarian Service Committee, spoke briefly on the needs of the Committee. The principal speaker of the evening was Dr. George D. Stoddard, President of the University of Illinois and Moderator of the American Unitarian Association. He spoke on the subject "New Approaches to Democracy."

SECOND BUSINESS SESSION

At the Second Business Session the Treasurer, Mr. Herbert E. Clapham, reported that the Conference had an operating deficit of $1,400. He pointed out that this was due to the fact that the United Unitarian Appeal had made only one payment during our fiscal year. While last year the Conference received $4,270 from the Appeal, this year only $1,792 was received. In all other respects the finances of the Conference are in good condition. It should be noted that the Conference books are closed on April 30, whereas the United Appeal books are kept open until nearly the middle of May.

Dr. Gardner Williams of Toledo, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, presented the names of nominees for the Board of the Conference. The nominees presented and elected were:

Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis
Mrs. B. A. McClelland, Minneapolis
Mrs. Jesse Meyers, Toledo

They will serve terms of four years. Mrs. Harry Ormes, Minneapolis, and Mrs. Dudley Moore of Detroit were the other members of the Nominating Committee.

The Conference acted on several resolutions presented by the Business Committee. The resolution of appreciation to the host churches was passed. A resolution recommending a nominee for the Editorial Board of the *Christian Register* was tabled. The resolution urging the American Unitarian Association to establish an office of information in Washington, D. C., was passed by a vote of 18 to 15 with a large number not voting. A resolution urging the United States government to recognize ethical principles as well as theological concepts as a basis for conscientious objectors and to establish a Civilian Service under civilian direction for conscientious objectors was passed. The resolution condemning the integration of public school systems with parochial schools and reaffirming the principle of separation of church and state was passed.

CONFERENCE SERMON

The Conference Sessions were brought to a close on Sunday morning, May 8, with the Annual Conference Sermon. Rev. John W. Cyrus of Omaha gave the sermon. The service was conducted by Rev. William D. Hammond.

There were 138 paid registrations to the Conference, although many more attended various sessions. The meetings were held May 6-8 at the People's Liberal Church with the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship assisting.

CONFERENCE BOARD MEETS

The Board of the Western Unitarian Conference met Sunday afternoon, May 8, in the home of the President, Dr. Curtis W. Reese, at Abraham Lincoln Centre. Dinner was served by Mrs. Reese, assisted by Mrs. Hilton.

During the business session the President announced the appointment of the Committee on the History of the Conference, on the instructions of the Board. The Committee is comprised of Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Chairman; Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, Mr. Randall S. Hilton. A progress report was made. Negotiations are under way with Dr. Charles H. Lyttle to prepare the manuscript to be published in time for the centennial meetings in 1952.

General discussion was held concerning the continuation of the United Unitarian Appeal and the necessity of some reorganization of the Appeal. The Board instructed its officers to negotiate with the Appeal and its participating organizations on the basis of maintaining the complete autonomy of the Conference. It favored the continuation of the Appeal, and with the assurance that our budgetary needs would be met pledges its full cooperation.

CHICAGO COUNCIL

The Chicago Council met Monday, May 9, to discuss with Dr. Raymond B. Bragg, Director of the Unitarian Service Committee, plans and procedures for a membership and financial campaign. Dr. Bragg explained the goal of $408,000 and pointed out the necessity of raising at least $100,000 by July 1. He also explained the new organizational setup of the Service Committee which is now one of individual memberships. The Council set up Special Gifts and Membership Committees. Mrs. Clifton Utley is Chairman of the Special Gifts Committee. The Membership Committee consists of Mr. Howard Hauze, Chairman; Mrs. Will Lyon, Mrs. Ralph Hicks, and Mrs. Wendall D. Hance. The Membership Committee will add to its number the local church chairman.

SERVICE RECORD

The April issue of *World Service* of the Unitarian Service Committee published the list of the first fifty churches in order of the number of pounds of clothing sent to the New York warehouse. Of the first fifty, the Western Unitarian Conference had 14 churches, the New England States Council 13, the Middle Atlantic States 12, the Pacific Coast Conference 7, the Meadville Conference 4. The Western Conference churches were:

Madison, Wisconsin
Iowa City, Iowa
St. Paul, Minnesota
Toledo, Ohio
Fort Wayne, Indiana
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Rockford, Illinois
St. Louis, Missouri
Evanston, Illinois
Detroit, Michigan
Chicago-First Church, Illinois
Indianapolis, Indiana
Louisville-First, Kentucky
Ann Arbor, Michigan

URBANA

The Urbana church has begun work on excavating the basement for the purpose of enlarging their church school facilities. The new rooms will be ready for occupancy in the fall.

HINSDALE

The Hinsdale church has purchased a parsonage for its minister, Rev. Raymond H. Palmer.

EDWIN H. WILSON

Rev. Edwin H. Wilson, minister of the Unitarian Church of Salt Lake City and former minister of the Third Church, Chicago, will become the full-time Executive Director of the American Humanist Association on August 4. The office of the association will be located in the Western Conference. Mr. Wilson has been active in the A.H.A. for the past 21 years.

BOOKS

Copies of the fast-selling book, *American Freedom and Catholic Power,* by Paul Blanshard, ($3.50) are available at the Conference Book Department.

From time to time publications of Western Conference ministers have been featured. Three of the newest additions to our stock are *Unitarian Definitions,* a book of verse by Robert T. Weston of Louisville; *Sheep and the Goats,* by E. Burdette Backus of Indianapolis; and *Unitarian Beliefs* by Arthur W. Olsen of Toledo. All of these volumes are $1.00 each.

Summer Assembly—August 28-September 4
College Camp, Lake Geneva, Wisconsin